

The regular monthly meeting of the City Planning Board was held on May 19, 2010 in the City Council Chambers in the City Hall Annex at 7:00 PM.

Present at the meeting were Members Swope (who as Vice Chair presided), Dolcino, Foss, Gross, Hicks, Meyer, and Alternate Member Kenison who was seated for absent Member Drypolcher. Messrs. Woodward and Henninger, Ms. Hebert and Ms. Osgood of the City Planning Division were also present, as was Ms. Aibel, the City's Associate Engineer.

At 7:04 PM a quorum was present and the Vice Chair called the meeting to order, and seated Alternate Member Kenison for Mr. Drypolcher, who was not expected.

1. Update on the **Bicycle Master Plan** process for Concord by the Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission.

Craig Tufts, from Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission, and Dick Lemieux, Chair of the Bicycle Subcommittee of the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee, were present to update the Planning Board on progress on the Bicycle Master Plan.

Mr. Tufts reported that the Committee had a meeting in January for the community at large from which they had received very good feedback. A different group of people came to the last meeting held in April. He indicated that they have a small amount of money to spend on a consultant to help them formulate the plan. He reported that they were surprised at the large number of responses they had received to their Request for Proposals and had chosen Vanasse Hangen Brustlin.

Ms. Meyer asked if they had looked at a formal connection between Langley Parkway and Auburn Street just north of the hospital. She felt people use it informally right now. Mr. Lemieux responded that the connection is being used by people for off-road bikes. If and when Langley Parkway is completed, there will likely be bicycle lanes but nothing else is proposed at this time. Nobody has suggested formalizing a path in the short term. Mr. Tufts indicated they would look into the possibility of creating a formal bike path in the short term. Mr. Gross supported the idea of connectivity between Langley Parkway and Auburn Street since he felt that it would be a very long time before automobile passage would be provided along a northerly extension of the Langley Parkway.

Mr. Gross also asked about the feasibility of rails to trails and Mr. Tufts responded that they are exploring those possibilities as well as some corridors along private property. Mr. Lemieux indicated they would like to pursue the feasibility of a trail along the full length of the river in Concord.

Mr. Tufts reported they would continue to work on the Bicycle Master Plan document and meet again with the Planning Board when there is a draft document to review.

APPLICATIONS

Minor Subdivision Application

2. Application by **Scandia Hall LLC, on behalf of the City of Concord** for approval of a subdivision of property by virtue of a conversion to a condominium of an existing non-residential building into four dwelling units at **14 Knight Street. (#2010-17)**

Determination of Completeness

Ms. Hebert explained this proposal to convert the existing building at 14 Knight Street, which is known as Scandia Hall, to four residential condominium units.

She reported this application was complete and ready for public hearing.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board find this application to be complete and open the public hearing. Ms. Dolcino seconded. Motion carried.

Public Hearing

Ms. Hebert explained this proposal to convert the existing building at 14 Knight Street, which is known as Scandia Hall, to four residential condominium units. Each unit will have two bedrooms and will be between 1200 and 1300 square feet. The property was formerly used as a community center for the City. The structure was built in 1862 as a school house and then became a community center in the late 1960's. The building was closed by the City in 1994 and has been vacant for the past fifteen years. The City would like to see the building preserved and has entered into an agreement to sell the property.

She reported that the Planning Board granted conditional site plan approval for the conversion of Scandia Hall to four residential units on November 18, 2009.

She also reported that a waiver had been requested to allow the applicant to submit plans at a scale of 1"= 10' instead of 1"=50' as required in the Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Hebert reported the Planning Board had received a communication from Matthew Walsh, the City's Assistant for Special Projects, who expressed City Administration's support of this project in order to help preserve and restore a historically significant property in West Concord.

Attorney Raymond D'Amante was present on behalf of Scandia Hall LLC as were Mark Carrier and John Jordan, as applicants, to answer questions from the Board.

There was no one who wished to speak for or against this application and the Vice Chair declared the hearing closed at 7:17 PM.

Deliberations and Action on Application

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board grant a waiver to Section 8.04 (2)(a)(ii) of the City's Subdivision Regulations to allow the subdivision plat to be submitted at a scale of 1"=10' instead of 1"=50'. Ms. Meyer seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board grant conditional final subdivision approval for the condominium conversion of Scandia Hall, LLC at 14 Knight Street, as prepared by John S. Jordan Design, Raymond P. D'Amante and Steven C. Luger subject to the following standard condition:

1. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the applicant shall revise the plat drawings and condominium documents to address the minor corrections and omissions noted by City staff.

Ms. Foss seconded. Motion carried.

Major Site Plan Applications

3. Application by **Concord National Little League on behalf of the City of Concord** for approval of a site plan of property located on **Iron Works Road**. Along with this application are requests for a Conditional Use Permits pursuant to Section 28-4-3(d), Conditional Use Permit Required for Certain Disturbance of Wetland Buffers, of the Zoning Ordinance. (**#2010-18**)

Determination of Completeness

Ms. Hebert explained the Concord National Little League proposes to construct a new little league baseball field at Russell Martin Park. The Site Plan application and Conditional Use Permits were approved by the Planning Board on March 19, 2008. However, the approval has expired and the applicant has filed a new application to re-establish the approval.

She reported this application was complete and ready to set for public hearing.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board find this application to be complete and set it for public hearing on June 16, 2010. Ms. Meyer seconded. Motion carried.

Architectural Design Review

4. Applications by the following for approval of signs at the following locations under the provisions of Section 28-9-4(f), Architectural Design Review, of the Code of Ordinances.
 - **Arrows and Embers Tattoo** for one hanging sign at **7 Pleasant Street Extension**
 - **Checkmate Pizza** for three affixed signs at **41 Washington Street**.
 - **Pizza Fina** for a replacement panel in free standing sign and a replacement affixed sign at **127 Warren Street**.

- **Tandy's Top Shelf Capitol Dining & Cocktails** for one hanging and one affixed sign at One Eagle Square

The Vice Chair opened the hearings on all of the above signs.

- **Arrows and Embers Tattoo** for one hanging sign at **7 Pleasant Street Extension**

Mr. Henninger reported that this is a replacement sign using the existing bracket.

He reported that the Design Review Committee found the proposed replacement sign to be appropriate for the location and use proposed, and recommended approval as submitted.

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant.

Ms. Meyer moved approval as submitted and Mr. Gross seconded. Motion carried.

- **Checkmate Pizza** for three affixed signs at **41 Washington Street**.

Mr. Henninger reported that Code Administration is continuing to work with the applicant.

Ms. Foss moved to table action until a revised design has been submitted. Mr. Kenison seconded. Motion carried.

- **Pizza Fina** for a replacement panel in free standing sign and a replacement affixed sign at **127 Warren Street**.

Mr. Henninger reported that the freestanding sign was recently damaged by wind and this was a replacement. The sign will be double-sided and illuminated like the original panel and the changeable copy panel will also be replaced.

He reported that the Design Review Committee felt the freestanding sign looked like several signs in one. There are many different color schemes and different fonts being used, and it lacked a unified design. Members suggested that the phone number be incorporated into the upper panel with a white background.

Mr. Henninger reported that the Design Review Committee found the proposed replacement sign to be appropriate for the location and use proposed, and recommended approval subject to the relocation of the phone number to the upper panel with a white background.

He reported that a revised design had been submitted for the freestanding sign with the telephone number relocated to the upper panel with a white background.

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant.

Ms. Meyer mentioned that she had a consistent objection to telephone numbers on signs. She felt signs were intended to identify a building and not to advertise.

Mr. Gross moved approval as revised and Mr. Hicks seconded. Motion carried, 6-1, with Ms. Meyer voting against.

- **Tandy's Top Shelf Capitol Dining & Cocktails** for one hanging and one affixed sign at One Eagle Square

Mr. Henninger explained this proposal for two replacement signs in compliance with the overall master sign plan for the complex. He reported they will be using a new bracket for the hanging sign.

He reported that the Design Review Committee found the proposed signage to be appropriate for the location and use proposed, and recommended approval as submitted.

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant.

Ms. Meyer moved approval as submitted and Mr. Kenison seconded. Motion carried.

5. Application by **Sam's Club** for approval of revisions to the exterior building colors, as well as to the canopies over the loading dock and retail gasoline facility, and the base of the free-standing sign, at **304 Sheep Davis Road. (#2010-20)**

Public Hearing

Mr. Henninger explained this proposal for a number of minor revisions to the previously approved building plans, including changing the color of the canopy for the retail gas facility to match the building. They are also adding one informational sign and painting the base of the freestanding sign. He noted that the free standing sign was destroyed in the wind storm last month and that there may be an application for a completely new sign shortly.

He reported that the Design Review Committee recommended approval of the revisions as submitted.

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Gross moved approval as submitted and Ms. Foss seconded. Motion carried.

6. Application by **TPC, Inc.** for approval of the location of a generator beside the building facing Centre Street, on the premises at **125 North Main Street. (#2010-19)**

Public Hearing

Mr. Henninger explained this proposal to place a generator beside the building and facing Centre Street.

He reported that the Design Review Committee had recommended that the applicant paint the generator black and implement the landscape plan of six yews with the understanding that the applicant or his agent will coordinate the size and location of the planting with the City's landscape architect.

Carolyn Amrol from R & T Electric, Inc. was present on behalf of the applicant to answer questions from the Board.

Ms. Meyer reminded the applicant's agent that the yews proposed for screening should be allowed to grow and not be pruned too closely.

Mr. Gross moved approval subject to the Design Review Committee recommendation that the applicant paint the generator black and implement the landscape plan of six yews with the understanding that the applicant or his agent will coordinate the size and location of the planting with the City's landscape architect. Ms. Foss seconded. Motion carried.

Amendments to the Subdivision Regulations

7. Consideration of an **amendment to the Subdivision Regulations** relative to application fees so as to incorporate the costs associated with the preparation, mailing, posting, and/or publishing of notice pursuant to RSA 676:4 I(d), and to application fees so as to incorporate a traffic impact review fee to cover the costs of the time of the City's Traffic Engineer.

Amendments to the Site Plan Review Regulations

8. Consideration of an **amendment to the Site Plan Review Regulations** relative to application fees so as to incorporate the costs associated with the preparation, mailing, posting, and/or publishing of notice pursuant to RSA 676:4 I(d), and to application fees so as to incorporate a traffic impact review fee to cover the costs of the time of the City's Traffic Engineer.

Public Hearings

The Vice Chair opened the hearings on both the above items since they were about related matters.

Mr. Woodward explained that application fees for the Subdivision Regulations and Site Plan Review Regulations were established as unified fees to include the costs associated with public notices which are primarily those associated with postage as certified mail is a requirement of the statute. Most communities in New Hampshire have a separate charge for the public notices in addition to the application fees. Some communities use the actual direct mailing cost, while others have a flat charge per notice which

incorporates the postage, as well as preparation of the mailing, envelopes, and labels.

He described the proposal for the cost of notices to not be included in the base application fee and to be passed through to the applicants in a manner similar to the costs of recording fees, which were previously included in the base application fee and were broken out last year to be charged directly to the applicants, consistent with standard procedure for the vast majority of New Hampshire communities. Concord has charged a unified fee that is inclusive of notice costs in part to minimize the number of financial transactions with each application and thereby simplifying the process for both the applicant and the City. While separate recording fees were simpler to handle as a one time charge at the end of the application process when documents needed to be recorded, the costs for notices are incurred every time an application comes before the Board. For a major subdivision, notices are sent for the determination of completeness and again for the public hearing, whereas there is only one notice for minor subdivisions for a single meeting inclusive of determination of completeness and public hearing. Beyond that, the application may be tabled by the Board or postponed at the request of the applicant and the next meeting at which the application is considered must be duly noticed.

He reported that a flat fee per notice is proposed at the rate of \$5.00 which is common among other New Hampshire communities. The notice fees for the determination of completeness and public hearing would be required to be submitted up front with the application, while the notice fees for tabled or postponed applications would be required to be submitted fifteen days before the meeting at which the application is expected to be further considered.

Mr. Woodward then described a proposal to further amend the application fees to include a traffic impact review fee to cover the costs of the time of the City's Traffic Engineer.

He explained that over the past 20 years the Planning Board has used a requirement for special investigative studies to retain, at an applicant's expense, experts in traffic, water supply, and environmental hazards to review the impacts of, or special circumstances related to, subdivision and site plan applications. The assessment of traffic impacts has been the most common circumstance, and a consulting traffic engineer was retained through the competitive proposal process to provide this service on an application by application basis.

He explained that the process on an individual application has been for an estimate to be prepared of a scope of services for the special study, with the applicant providing a deposit in the amount of 125% of the estimate which would cover any contingencies. The funds are placed in an account and drawn down as the review proceeds. At the conclusion, if funds remain, they are returned to the applicant.

He reported that in 2008 the City hired a traffic engineer to serve on the staff of the Engineering Division. With this capability available in-house, the City Engineer forwarded a proposal asking that the Board allow the expert service for special studies

to be provided by a qualified professional employee of the City in lieu of contracting with an outside consultant. In the event that the Board agreed to provide this option, the proposal was for the same sort of financial arrangements to continue but with the expert employee's department receiving the reimbursement for the services provided. At the same time, a new statute, RSA 676:4-b, Third Party Review and Inspection, was approved by the Legislature and became effective on August 8, 2009, which created some new legal issues relative to utilizing a staff position to perform special investigative studies.

Mr. Woodward reported that the City Solicitor's office had reviewed the new statute and concluded that it was intended to allow for the Board to retain outside consultants to provide an independent review or consultation, and that the employment of City staff in that capacity was not appropriate. However, the Solicitor's office also deemed that it would be appropriate for the Board to expand its application fee structure so as to incorporate costs associated with the type of specialized review that the traffic engineer would provide. The Solicitor's office also noted that the Board may still have occasion where it might not agree with the City Traffic Engineer's conclusions and may wish to exercise its authority to require a third party review at the applicant's expense pursuant to RSA 676:4-b.

He explained that it was proposed that the Subdivision Regulations and Site Plan Review Regulations be amended to add a traffic impact review fee for major subdivisions and site plans which would be expected to exceed the thresholds for traffic impact review previously established by the Board, which are applications which are expected to generate greater than twenty vehicle trip ends during the peak hour period or greater than two hundred vehicle trip ends per day on the local road network.

He reported that the current provisions for special investigative studies would remain in place for the Board to exercise as they may deem necessary and appropriate for circumstances that might be encountered with a particular application.

Edward Roberge, City Engineer, was present to speak in favor of the proposed fees relative to traffic engineer fees. He explained that he realized that costs of using outside consultants were substantial both for design services and for review services. This proposal is part of the Engineering Division's program to bring all of those services back in house. As other services have gradually been brought back in house, they have found that it works very well and has been well received, both as a matter of cost savings and of efficiency. Along with an increased quality of the review, the developer has seen a cost savings of about 50%.

Mr. Gross noted that there is a bill, HB 1486, working its way through Legislature regarding residential sprinkler systems and he asked what it would take to include within the Subdivision Regulations the Board's policy of requiring residential sprinkler systems in rural areas. Mr. Woodward responded that the Planning Board would have to have a duly noticed public hearing on any amendment to the Regulations. He also noted that there is some language in the draft Subdivision Regulations regarding

residential sprinklers that will be discussed later in the evening and which may serve the Board's purpose if they wish to consider an amendment to the current Regulations.

Members agreed to take this up later in the meeting when discussing the draft Subdivision Regulations.

There was no one else who wished to speak for or against these amendments and the Vice Chair declared the hearings closed at 7:49 PM.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board adopt the proposed amendments to both the Subdivision Regulations and the Site Plan Review Regulations in respect to application fees so as to incorporate the costs associated with the preparation, mailing, posting, and/or publishing of notices pursuant to RSA 676:4I(D) and, further, so as to incorporate a traffic impact review fee to cover the cost of the time for the City's Traffic Engineer to conduct the reviews. Mr. Kenison seconded. Motion carried.

REGULAR MEETING

Minutes

Mr. Gross moved adoption of the minutes of the Planning Board meeting of April 21, 2010, as submitted. Ms. Foss seconded. Motion carried.

Applications

10. Request for an extension of the period of validity of the conditional approvals of the Minor Subdivision Application of **Sandy Brook Corporation, Dwight Keeler, and Leslie Keeler**, as well as the Major Subdivision Application of **the Sandy Brook Corporation** known as the **Glen Ellen Cluster Subdivision, both at 153 Hoit Road. (#2008-08 and #2008-21)**

Mr. Woodward explained that The Woodland Design Group, Inc. has forwarded requests for extensions of the conditional subdivision approvals of the above referenced applications seeking to extend the period of validity for both through August 20, 2011.

He explained that the Planning Board, at a meeting on August 20, 2008, granted conditional final approval of the Minor Subdivision application of Sandy Brook Corporation, Dwight Keeler, and Leslie Keeler, as well as the Major Subdivision application of the Sandy Brook Corporation known as the Glen Ellen Cluster Subdivision, both at 153 Hoit Road. The original approvals were valid for a period of one year or until August 20, 2009. The Planning Board, at a meeting on August 19, 2009, granted a waiver of the Subdivision Regulations for a one-year extension for these applications, extending the period of validity through August 20, 2010, and indicating that all conditions of the original subdivision approvals shall remain in full force and effect.

He reported that any extensions of a final subdivision approval may be granted by the Board as a waiver of the Subdivision Regulations, and the Board has often granted one-year extensions, but has generally required that an applicant present requests for anything more than that at the end of the one year extension. The Board has evaluated such requests at that time to determine if conditions related to the subdivision have changed or otherwise warrant another one-year extension. If conditions have changed, the Board has denied the waiver for a further extension, and after several extensions, the Board has also indicated to applicants that a requested extension will be the final one as the passage of time alone creates an issue in terms of new abutters having no recorded plat as a means of learning of the existence of the application and the pending change in their neighborhood.

He reported that, in this case, there are no changes in zoning or other regulations which might otherwise warrant denial of an extension. In addition, the applicants have indicated that economic conditions have prevented them from initiating the construction of the improvements, although they hope to start construction this Fall. Given the current market conditions, a one-year extension appears to be reasonable for the Board to grant.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board grant a waiver of the Subdivision Regulations for a one-year extension for these applications, extending the period of validity through August 20, 2011, and indicate that all conditions of the original subdivision approvals shall remain in full force and effect. Ms. Meyer seconded. Motion carried.

New Business

11. Consideration of a hearing notice from the Loudon Planning Board relative to an amended Site Plan application by the **NH Motor Speedway** which has been determined to be Development of Regional Impact.

Mr. Henninger explained that the Planning Board had received from the Loudon Planning Board a notice of public hearing relative to an application by the New Hampshire Motor Speedway for a Change of Use and an amendment to a previously approved Site Plan application in order to allow a 2011 winter snowmobile event. He reported that, per a condition of the 1999 Site Plan approval, the Loudon Planning Board has prohibited the use of the Speedway between October 31st and April 1st. The current request involves changing this condition to allow the speedway to host a snowmobile event on a weekend at the end of February, 2011. A similar event took place last February and the City did not receive any complaints.

He reported that last year the Concord Planning Board had advised the Loudon Planning Board as follows:

1. The proposed size of the event and its timing on a February weekend should not present any extraordinary traffic impacts on streets and highways in Concord. If the event is successful, and grows substantially over time, traffic management on

Rte 106, I-393 and I-93 may need to be implemented in a manner similar to major racing events.

2. The Planning Board recommended that the Speedway contact the Concord Police Department to make them aware of the event date and its potential to increase snowmobile traffic on the trails throughout Concord.

He reported that he had consulted with the City's Police Chief who indicated that they had received no complaints and had no further comments in this regard.

Mr. Gross moved and Ms. Foss seconded that the Planning Board direct the Planning Division to communicate to the Loudon Planning Board that last year's comments are still relevant. Motion carried.

12. Consideration of **amendments to the Zoning Ordinance** to address changes to the Flood **Hazard (FH) District** pursuant to a compliance review for the National Flood Insurance Program.

Mr. Henninger explained that in January 2010 the Board considered an amendment to the Flood Hazard District adopting a new Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). The City Council subsequently acted on the Board's favorable recommendation and adopted the new FIRM effective April 19, 2010. This action was required to keep the City in compliance with the requirements of the federal Flood Insurance Program to maintain federal flood insurance coverage in the City of Concord.

He reported that the NH Office of Energy and Planning (NHOEP) has since provided further commentary on the City's Flood Hazard Protection Ordinances as contained in the City's Building Code and Zoning Ordinance. OEP has advised that modifications need to be made to these ordinances in order to conform to the federal regulations and maintain the City's eligibility for federal flood insurance.

The Planning Division has reviewed the comments made by NHOEP and has prepared two ordinance amendments, one of which is a modification to Chapter 26, Building Regulations, of the Code of Ordinance, to include a reference to the newly adopted FIRM. This is a citation and adoption of the new FIRM within the Building Code, paralleling what was previously adopted for the Zoning Ordinance.

The second proposed ordinance contains amendments to the Zoning Ordinance, adding a new subsection to the Flood Hazard (FH) District to address substantial improvements to existing residential structures located in the One Hundred and Five Hundred-year Floodplains. The Zoning Ordinance already contains standards regulating non-residential development within the floodplain and prohibits new residential development in the One Hundred-year floodplain and the FH Zone along the Merrimack River. NHOEP raised the issue that federal regulations require design standards for modifications to existing structures proposed to undergo substantial improvement within the floodplain. The proposed new subsection 28-3-2(j) contains standards designed to address this circumstance.

Another subsection of the proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance adds specific definitions for floodplain management purposes. These definitions are federally prescribed definitions which differ somewhat from the City's existing definitions contained in the Zoning Ordinance, which were carefully developed to support the Zoning Ordinance as a whole, not just floodplain management regulations. In order to maintain the internal consistency of the Zoning Ordinance, the definitions contained in the proposed amendment will only apply to the regulation of property within the Flood Hazard (FH) District.

Ms. Foss moved and Mr. Gross seconded that the Planning Board forward the proposed ordinances to the City Council with a favorable recommendation for their adoption. Motion carried.

Old Business

13. Review of Section 20, Street Layout and Access Standards; Section 21, Design Standards for Streets and Private Drives; and Section 22, Sidewalks, Bicycle paths, and Trails, of the **proposed new Subdivision Regulations**.

Before starting review of Sections 20, 21 and 22 of the proposed new Subdivision Regulations, Mr. Gross again brought up the subject of HB 1486 that would prohibit the mandating of residential sprinkler systems in certain dwellings and establishing a committee to study municipal residential fire sprinkler requirements.

He noted that Planning Board policy is that outside the Urban Growth Boundary primarily in major subdivisions, a structure would be required as a condition of approval to be constructed with a residential sprinkler system. Mr. Woodward reported that there was language in the proposed Subdivision Regulations that would formalize the requirement for residential sprinklers on lots in subdivisions which would not be served by municipal water supply.

Mr. Gross asked if this language could be adopted on an expedited basis prior to the effective date of the proposed new statute. Mr. Woodward responded that this language had been vetted with the Fire Department, and the Planning Division could advertise a public hearing to be held at the Board's special meeting scheduled on June 2, 2010.

Mr. Kenison moved to set an amendment to the Subdivision Regulations, to require residential sprinkler systems for subdivisions not served by the municipal water system, for public hearing at the Board's special meeting on June 2, 2010. Mr. Gross seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Henninger then began the review of Section 20 of the proposed Subdivision Regulations relating to street layout and access standards. He explained that Section 20 is an elaboration of what the Planning Board has been requiring for the last twenty years.

He directed the Board's attention to Table 20-1, Standards for Residential Common Private Drives. He discussed the proposed new common private drive provisions. The existing standard is a single standard regardless of size of development or number of units being served. Three different standards are now being proposed, based on the number of proposed units. He reported they had also added maximum grades, grades in cul-de-sacs, cross slopes, design speeds, sidewalks, curbing, on-street parking, and terminus or turnaround standards.

Ms. Foss noted that, for curbing outside the Urban Growth Boundary in particular, she would like to see a requirement that there be sloped curbing wherever possible or a prohibition of vertical curbing. In rural areas amphibians and small vertebrates cannot get past the vertical curbing. Inside the Urban Growth Boundary it is not as much an issue.

Mr. Henninger explained that the sloped curbing in the entrance medians to some developments have not held up well. That might be the only place where vertical curbing might continue to make sense.

Ms. Foss noted that if the intent is to be flexible within a development so that different applications of curbing could be used, that would be the best of all worlds as far as she was concerned.

Members agreed to revise the Table to indicate that if curbing is to be used, sloped curbing would be the standard, and vertical curbing may be permitted by the Planning Board as an exception, in areas outside the Urban Growth Boundary.

Ms. Dolcino had a question regarding sidewalks and how limiting the Table is for the Board. Mr. Woodward responded that generally if there are conflicts between a table and the written text, the stricter standard prevails.

Ms. Dolcino suggested an addition to the general requirements providing a general waiver authority for the Planning Board. Mr. Swope suggested a general statement on the tables themselves.

It was the consensus of the Planning Board that the Board wanted to reserve the ability to apply a higher standard if it was necessary for a development. Mr. Henninger indicated he would look at that possibility.

Mr. Henninger then continued with discussion of Section 21, Design Standards for Streets and Private Drives. He reported a standard for roundabouts had been added and the number of street standards had been increased from three to six categories. He reported that standards had been revised for cul-de-sacs. He explained that the current standards were created because General Services wanted to be able to plow snow into the center of a cul-de-sac instead of into abutting driveways. Staff had used a fire truck turning radius to create the proposed design criteria for dimensions for cul-de-sacs in this draft. This ended up providing a substantial reduction in area for the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Henninger finished by briefly discussing Section 22, Sidewalks, Bicycle Paths, and Trails. He reported that paragraphs had been added regarding multi-use paths and trails.

Board members were reminded of the special meeting on June 2, 2010 in the Second Floor Conference Room at City Hall at which discussion will focus on the remaining design sections, Sections 23-29, following the public hearing relative to amendments to the Subdivision Regulations related to sprinkler system requirements.

There was no further business to come before the Board and the meeting adjourned at 9:07 PM.

A TRUE RECORD ATTEST:

Douglas G. Woodward
Clerk

o